DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 958 SP 019 868

AUTHOR Etheridge, George W.; And Others
TITLE Discipline. Beliefs of Student Teachers and Directing Teachers.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *Classroom Techniques; Cooperating Teachers; *Discipline; Educational Psychology; Higher Education; Interaction; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Three major schools of psychological thought about classroom discipline have been identified. Interventionists believe that student behavior is controlled by teachers through appropriate reward and punishment. Non-interventionists believe that students are masters of their destinies and have the innate capability of solving their problems. Interactionalists believe that the whole child can only be understood by the interrelationship of all parts (including external and internal events and environment). This study examined whether or not student teachers had a well developed, consistent set of beliefs about discipline and whether or not student teaching affected those beliefs. A group of student teachers completed the Beliefs on Discipline Inventory (BDI) prior to and immediately following their student teaching experience. The BDI is built around the three major schools of psychological thought and is designed for teachers to assess their own beliefs about classroom discipline. Teachers who directed student teachers during their field experience also completed the BDI. Analysis of data revealed that, at the beginning of the field experience, student teachers consistently ranked non-interventionist, interventionist, and interactionalist (in that order) as their most preferred model of discipline. At the end of their student teaching experience, a significantly larger number of student teachers chose the interventionist model. They also less often selected beliefs and techniques consistent with the non-interventionist and interactionalist models. After the teaching experience, there was little difference between the student teachers and their directing teachers in choosing the most preferred discipline model. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED215958

SP

# Discipline Beliefs of Student Teachers and Directing Teachers

by

George W. Etheridge, Associate Professor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education
Memphis State University

and

Terry L. James, Assistant Professor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Director, Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences
College of Education
Memphis State University

and

Gregory W. Bryant, Doctoral Student
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Graduate Assistant, Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences
College of Education
Memphis State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terry L. James

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 019 868

## Introduction

> Our youths love luxury. They have bad manners, contempt for authority; they show disrespect for elders, and love to chatter in place of exercise. Children are now tyrants, not the servants of the households. They no longer rise when their elders enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before compnay, gobble up their food, and tyrannize their teachers. (Socrates, 400. B.C.)

Socrates' classic lament concerning the youth of his day could easily have been made by a teacher, principal or parent in modern America. Disruptive behavior in the classroom is the number one concern of beginning teachers (Osborn and Osborn, 1977), experienced teachers and administrators (Good and Brophy, 1978) and the American public (Gallup, 1981). A new term, "battered teacher" (Bloch, 1977), has even been coined and teachers are leaving the profession at an astounding rate (NEA, 1981).

What seems to be new, however, is the frustration that teachers face when attempting to make the traditional techniques of discipline work with today's students (Raffini, 1980). No single method of handling discipline problems works in every case (Wolfgang and Glickman, 1980). Yet something as complex as classroom discipline cannot be reduced to simple cookbook recipes or left existentially to the events of the day or whims of emotion. Teachers need to have a well thought out, consistent set of beliefs about effective classroom discipline (Good and Brophy, 1978). Glickman and Tamashiro (1980) believe that a well thought out, consistent set of beliefs about classroom discipline allows a teacher to organize his/her discipline techniques and validate or reject them in his/her daily teaching. When this occurs teachers are more likely to develop individual strategies to meet the needs of each particular discipline situation.

To help teachers organize and make sense out of the many different theories and techniques of classroom discipline, Wolfgang and Glickman (1980) identified three major schools of psychological thought about classroom discipline, i.e., interventionist, non-interventionist and interactionalist. These three schools of psychological thought about classroom discipline vary on a continuum of teacher-student control. Simply put, the interventionists draw their rationale from behaviorally oriented experimental psychologists who believe that human action is a matter of external conditioning. A student's behavior is controlled by the teacher through adequate reward and punishment techniques. The non-interventionists, on the other hand, draw their beliefs from humanistic and psychoanalytic thought. They believe individuals, if given the opportunity, will be able to positively manage their own behavior. Students are the masters of their own destinies and have the innate capability of solving their own problems. Finally, the interactionalist look to the Social, Gestalt and developmental psychologists to understand students' actions. They believe the whole child can only be understood by the interrelationship of all the parts. An individual must be viewed as part of his/her total environment, in terms of what goes on both internally and externally. The teacher, student, classmates and physical setting all work together in creating problems as well as solving them.

Using Wolfgang and Glickman's (1980) three major schools of psychological thought about discipline, Tamashiro (1980) developed a Beliefs on Discipline Inventory (BDI). The BDI is designed for teachers to assess their own beliefs on classroom discipline. It enables them to approximate to what extent they

believe in the Interventionist, the Non-Interventionist, and the Interactionalist models of discipline. The assumption is that teachers believe and act according to all three models of discipline, yet one usually predominates in their beliefs and actions.

Wolfgang (1980) has used the BDI as a vehicle for professional development activities. Typically, the entire professional staff of a school or individual teachers complete the BDI, review their profile of beliefs about discipline, and develop strategies for systematic change when it is judged desirable. Glickman and Tamashiro (1980) suggested that the BDI be used as a self diagnostic-prescriptive instrument for improving one's classroom discipline. Using the BDI, Cervetti and Etheridge (1980) showed that teachers do have an implicit set of beliefs about discipline and that these beliefs do not vary as a function of the teachers sex, race, location of school/ (i.e., urban vs. surburban), funding source (i.e., public vs. private), or size of school. The interactionalist model was the most preferred disciplinary philosophy of teachers, interventionist the next, and non-interventionist the least. No teacher, however, with less than two years teaching experience chose the interventionist position but there was a slight trend for teachers to move towards the interventionist model the longer they had taught.

The fact that no teacher with less than two years experience in the Cervetti and Etheridge (1980) study preferred the interventionist model of discipline but it became the preferred model of discipline the longer teachers taught led the current researchers to question whether or not beginning teachers had a well thought out, consistent set of beliefs about discipline and whether or

not student teaching affected their beliefs about discipline. This translated into three specific research questions to guide the present study:

1. Do student teachers have a well thought out, consistent set of beliefs about discipline?
2. Do student teachers change their beliefs about discipline as a function of student teaching?
3. Do student teachers differ from directing teachers in their beliefs about discipline?

## Sample

The sample consisted of 302 Memphis State University students who completed their student teaching during the Fall and Spring semesters of the 1980-81 academic year and the 210 classroom teachers who served as their directing teachers. Table 1 describes the number and percent of student teachers by sex, race, age, and major. Table 2 describes the number and percent of directing teachers by sex, race, years teaching experience, location of school, size of school, grades in school, and grade/subject taught.

Table 1

Number and Percent of Student Teachers
By Sex, Race, Age and Major (N=302)

| VARIABLE | STUDENTS | |
|---|---|---|
| | N | % |
| Sex | | |
| Female | 256 | 84.8 |
| Male | 46 | 15.2 |
| Race | | |
| Black | 48 | 15.9 |
| White | 253 | 83.8 |
| Other | 1 | 0.3 |
| Age | | |
| 20-24 | 189 | 62.6 |
| 25-29 | 60 | 19.9 |
| 30-34 | 23 | 7.6 |
| 35+ | 28 | 9.3 |
| Not reported | 2 | .7 |
| Major | | |
| Early Childhood | 30 | 9.9 |
| Elementary-Kindergarten | 9 | 3.0 |
| Elementary | 34 | 11.3 |
| RIP-Elementary | 37 | 12.3 |
| Special Education | 44 | 14.6 |
| Elementary/Special Ed. | 9. | 3.0 |
| Secondary/Special Ed. | 5 | 1.7 |
| Secondary Education | 134 | 44.4 |

Table 2

Number and Percent of Directing Teachers by Sex, Race, Teaching Experience, Location of School, Size of School, Grades in School, Grade/Subject Taught (N=210)

| VARIABLE | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Sex | | |
| Female | 183 | 87.1 |
| Male | 27 | 12.9 |
| Race | | |
| Black | 50 | 23.8 |
| White | 159 | 75.7 |
| Other | 1 | .5 |
| Years Teaching Experience | | |
| 0-4 yrs. | 23 | 10.9 |
| 5-9 yrs. | 46 | 21.9 |
| 10-14 yrs. | 59 | 28.1 |
| 15+ yrs. | 81 | 38.6 |
| Not reported | 1 | .5 |
| Location of School | | |
| Inner City | 59 | 28.1 |
| Surburban | 141 | 67.1 |
| Other | 10 | 4.8 |
| Size of School | | |
| 499 and fewer students | 36 | 17.2 |
| 500-749 | 72 | 34.3 |
| 750-999 | 45 | 21.4 |
| 1000+ students | 47 | 22.4 |
| Not reported | 10 | 4.8 |

Table 2 (continued)

| VARIABLE | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Grades in School | | |
| 1st thru 2nd | 2 | 1.0 |
| 1st thru 3rd | 19 | 9.0 |
| 3rd thru 4th | 1 | .5 |
| 1st thru 6th | 85 | 40.5 |
| 4th thru 6th | 17 | 8.1 |
| 5th thru 6th | 4 | 1.9 |
| 1st thru 8th | 6 | 2.9 |
| 7th thru 9th | 20 | 9.5 |
| 10th thru 12th | 23 | 11.0 |
| 7th thru 12th | 12 | 5.7 |
| 9th thru 12th | 17 | 8.1 |
| Not reported | 4 | 1.9 |
| Grade/Subject Taught | | |
| Kindergarten | 26 | 12.4 |
| First | 14 | 6.7 |
| Second | 21 | 10.0 |
| Third | 15 | 7.1 |
| Fourth | 10 | 4.8 |
| Fifth | 6 | 2.9 |
| Sixth | 6 | 2.9 |
| Art | 13 | 6.2 |
| Business | 4 | 1.9 |
| Distributive Ed. | 2 | 1.0 |
| English | 7 | 3.3 |
| Foreign Language | 2 | 1.0 |
| Home Economics | 6 | 2.9 |
| Health | 1 | .5 |
| Math | 6 | 2.9 |
| Music | 2 | 1.0 |

Table 2 (continued)

| VARIABLE | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| P.E. | 14 | 6.7 |
| Science | 6 | 2.9 |
| History/Social Studies | 9 | 4.3 |
| Speech | 2 | 1.0 |
| Special Education | 33 | 15.7 |
| Not reported | 5 | 2.4 |

## Procedure

Before beginning their student teaching, student teachers have a required group meeting with the Director of Professional Laboratory Experiences. They receive the necessary instructions and forms to begin student teaching at this meeting. Towards the end of this meeting the research was explained, questions answered, assurances given that the research had nothing to do with their grade in student teaching and the BDI was distributed. Upon completing the BDI, students turned it in to the investigator and left. It took from 10-20 minutes for students to complete the inventory.

One of the last things student teachers do as part of their student teaching is return to campus and participate in a wrap-up group session with the Director of Professional Laboratory Experiences. The purpose of this wrap-up session is to answer questions, share "war stories," make suggestions for improvement and evaluate the student teaching experience, directing teacher and university supervisor. Towards the end of this meeting the research was again explained, questions answered, assurances given that the research had nothing to do with their grade in student teaching and the BDI was distributed. Upon completing the BDI, students turned it in to the investigator and left.

The BDI data for the directing teachers was collected only once. During the last three weeks of their student teacher's placement, a BDI was mailed to each directing teacher's school address. A cover letter explained the study and requested the directing teacher to complete the BDI and return it to the Office of Professional Laboratory Experiences at Memphis State University. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was provided to each directing teacher for the return of the completed BDI. About 60 percent of the directing teachers returned the completed BDI.

The data collection procedure for the student teachers and directing teachers was followed in Fall Semester 1980 and repeated in the Spring Semester of 1981.

## Instrument

The Beliefs on Discipline Inventory (Glickman and Tamshiro, 1980) is a paper and pencil inventory that assesses a teacher's beliefs on discipline according to the three dominant psychological schools of thought about discipline, i.e., non-interventionists, interactionalist, and interventionists. The researchers attached a cover page to the inventory which briefly explained the three schools of thought about discipline and asked the respondent to keep the explanations in mind when completing the inventory. The inventory consists of two parts: prediction items and forced choice items. The prediction items ask the teacher which school of discipline dominates his/her beliefs. Each of the twelve forced choice items pits a belief or technique from one school of thought against a belief or technique from another school. The respondent selects the belief or technique closest to his/her own. A score of between 0 and 100 is derived for each school of thought. A section on demographic information was attached as a separate section after the prediction items. Demographic information collected on student teachers was sex, race, age, and program major; and for directing teachers it was sex, race, years teaching experience, location of school, size of school, number of grades in school, and grade or subject taught.

## Data Analysis

Chi square and Pearson correlations were used to analyze data relevant to question one---Do student teachers have a well thought out, consistent set of beliefs about discipline? Question two---Do student teachers change their beliefs about discipline as a function of student teaching?--was analyzed by using the

the T-Test for independent samples. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, was utilized for processing all data.

## Results

### Question I

Do student teachers have a well thought out, consistent set of beliefs about discipline?

#### Pre-Test

Before beginning their student teaching 35.10 percent (N=106) of the student teachers ranked the interventionist model of discipline as the school of discipline they believed in the strongest. Likewise, 48.01 percent (N=145) chose the non-interventionist model and 16.89% (N=51) chose the interactionalist model. Chi Square analysis of the student teachers' ranking of their most preferred model of discipline showed that the rankings were independent of sex ($x^2$ of .12449 with 2 degrees of freedom was significant at the .93965 level), race ($x^2$ of 3.16276 with 8 degrees of freedom was significant at the .92373 level). Empty cells and low cell frequencies for some cells made the Chi Square analysis of ranking by program major non-meaningful. Inspection of the crosstabs revealed no apparent relationship between the student teachers' most preferred model of discipline and their program major.

Table 3 shows the Pearson Correlation between student teacher's rankings of their most preferred model of discipline and the score they obtained on each model when forced to select specific discipline beliefs and techniques consistent with each model.

Table 3

Pearson Correlation between Student Teachers' Preferred Model of Discipline and the Pre-Test Score They Obtained on Each Model (N=302)

| | SCORE 1 INTERVENTIONIST | | | SCORE 2 NON-INTERVENTIONIST | | | SCORE 3 INTERACTIONALIST | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | r | N | sig | r | N | sig | r | N | sig |
| Preferred Model of Discipline | -.2716 | 302 | .001 | .2262 | 302 | .001 | .1016 | 302 | .039 |

Inspection of Table 3 reveals a significant (p7.001) negative correlation (r= -.2716) between students' ranking of their most preferred models of discipline and their selection of interventionists discipline techniques and beliefs. Likewise, significant (p=..001 and .039) positive correlations (r=.2262 and .1016) were respectively found for the non-interventionists and the interactionalist. This means that, before beginning student teaching, student teachers who viewed themselves as non-interventionists or interactionalist selected disciplinary techniques and beliefs that were consistent with their preferred model of discipline. Students who viewed themselves as interventionist, on the other hand, selected disciplinary techniques and beliefs that were inconsistent with their preferred model of discipline.

Table 4 displays the results of the Pre-Test Pearson Correlation between how often (i.e., 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, 0%) student teachers thought they would use each of the models of discipline and their selection of disciplinary techniques and beliefs indicative of each model.

Table 4

Pre-Test Pearson Correlation between How Often Student Teachers Thought They Would Use Each Model of Discipline and the Score They Obtained on Each Model of Discipline (N=302)

| HOW OFTEN MODEL USED | SCORE ON EACH MODEL | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | INTERVENTIONISTS | | | NON-INTERVENTIONISTS | | | INTERACTIONALIST | | |
| | r | N | Sig | r | N | Sig | r | N | Sig |
| INTERVENTIONISTS | -.2767 | 302 | .001 | .2833 | 302 | .001 | .0384 | 302 | .250 |
| NON-INTERVENTIONISTS | .2104 | 302 | .001 | -.2553 | 302 | .001 | .0197 | 302 | .366 |
| INTERACTIONALIST | .1616 | 302 | .002 | -.1990 | 302 | .001 | .0186 | 302 | .374 |

Examination of Table 4 shows significant ($p > .001$) negative correlations ($r=-.2767$ and $r=-.2553$) between how often student teachers thought they would use an interventionist or a non-interventionist model of discipline and how often they selected disciplinary techniques and beliefs consistent with the interventionist or non-interventionists model. This means that how often beginning student teachers thought they would use an interventionists or non-interventionist disciplinary model was exactly opposite how often they chose these respective disciplinary techniques and beliefs when confronted with written disciplinary situations. The positive correlation of .0186 indicated a non-significant ($p > .374$) trend for beginning student teachers to estimate how often they would use the interactionalist model of discipline and then choose disciplinary techniques and beliefs consistent with the interactionalists model.

Posttest

At the end of their student teaching 40.15 percent (N=108) of the student teachers ranked the interventionist model of discipline as the one they believed in the strongest. Likewise, 46.10 percent (N=124) chose the non-interventionist model and 13.75 percent chose the interactionalist model. Chi Square analysis of

the student teachers' ranking of their most preferred model of discipline showed that the rankings were independent of sex ($x^2$ of 3.28338 with 3 degrees of freedom was significant at the .34996 level), race ($x^2$ of 9.73197 with 6 degrees of freedom was significant at the .13640 level) and age ($x^2$ of 6.55874 with 12 degrees of freedom was significant at the .88534 level). Empty cells and low cell frequencies for some cells made the Chi Square analysis of ranking by program major non-meaningful. Inspection of the Crosstabs revealed no apparent relationship between the student teachers' most preferred model of discipline and their program major.

Table 5 shows the Pearson Correlation between student teachers' rankings of their most preferred model of discipline and the score they obtained on each model when forced to select specific disciplinary beliefs and techniques consistent with each model.

Table 5

Pearson Correlation Between Student Teachers' Preferred Model of Discipline and the Posttest Score They Obtained on Each Model (N=302)

| | SCORE 1 INTERVENTIONISTS | | | SCORE 2 NON-INTERVENTIONISTS | | | SCORE 3 INTERACTIONALIST | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | r | N | Sig | r | N | Sig | r | N | Sig |
| PREFERRED MODEL OF DISCIPLINE | .2793 | 302 | .001 | .4448 | 302 | .001 | .5926 | 302 | .001 |

Inspection of Table 5 reveals significant ($p>.001$) positive correlations ($r=.2793$, .4448 and .5926) between student teachers' posttest ranking of each model of discipline as to its preference as their most preferred model of discipline and their selection of disciplinary technqiues and beliefs consistent with each respective

model. This means that, after student teaching, student teachers' selected disciplinary techniques and beliefs consistent with their conceptual view of themselves as disciplinarians.

Table 6 displays the results of the posttest Pearson Correlation between how often (i.e., 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, 0%) student teachers though they used each model of discipline in their student teaching and their selection of disciplinary techniques and beliefs indicative of each model.

Table 6

Posttest Pearson Correlation Between How Often Student Teachers Thought They Used Each Model of Discipline and The Score They Obtained On Each Model of Discipline (N=302)

| HOW OFTEN MODEL USED | SCORE ON EACH MODEL | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | INTERVENTIONISTS | | | NON-INTERVENTIONISTS | | | INTERACTIONALISTS | | |
| | r | N | Sig | r | N | Sig | r | N | Sig |
| INTERVENTIONISTS | -.1168 | 302 | .021 | .1126 | 302 | .025 | .0191 | 302 | .371 |
| NON-INTERVENTIONIST | .0393 | 302 | .248 | -.1912 | 302 | .001 | -.0189 | 302 | .372 |
| INTERACTIONALISTS | .344 | 302 | .276 | -.0353 | 302 | .270 | .0100 | 302 | .432 |

Examination of Table 6 shows significant ($p > .021$ and .001) negative correlations ($r = -.1168$ and $-.1912$) between how often student teachers thought they used respective interventionist or non-interventionist model of discipline in their student teaching and how often they selected disciplinary techniques and beliefs consistent with the interventionist or non-interventionist model. This means that how often students finishing student teaching thought they had used an interventionist or non-interventionist disciplinary model in their student teaching was exactly opposite how often they chose these respective disciplinary techniques and beliefs when confronted with written disciplinary situations. The positive cor-

relation of .0100 indicated a non-significant ($p > .432$) trend for students finishing their student teaching to estimate how often they had used the interactionalists model of discipline then chose disciplinary techniques and beliefs consistent with the interactionalists model.

Question 2

Do student teachers change their beliefs about discipline as a function of student teaching?

There was a significant ($p > .01$) positive Pearson Correlation ($r=.1214$) between the student teachers' pre-test rankings of the discipline model and the posttest rankings. The preferred rankings for both tests were non-interventionists, interventionists and interactionalist. Analysis of the mean score for the two rankings, however, revealed the pre-test mean ranking of 1.8179 to be significantly ($p > .0001$) larger than the posttest mean ranking of 1.5464. (See Table 7) Inspection of the absolute frequencies for each model but between pre-test and posttest showed that more student teachers chose the interventionists model after student teaching than before student teaching. (See Table 8)

Table 7

T-Test for Student Teachers Preferred Ranking of Discipline Models (N=302)

| | d.f. | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-test Ranking | 301 | 1.8179 | .6988 | 4.5926 | .0001 |
| Posttest Ranking | 301 | 1.5464 | .8449 | | |

Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages of Student Teachers' Preference for Each Model of Discipline at the Pretest and Posttest

| | PRE-TEST | | POSTTEST | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| INTERVENTIONISTS | 106 | 35.10 | 108 | 40.15 |
| NON-INTERVENTIONISTS | 145 | 48.01 | 124 | 46.10 |
| INTERACTIONALISTS | 51 | 16.89 | 37 | 13.75 |
| | N= 302 | | N=269 | |

Table 9 displays the student teachers' pretest and posttest mean score on each model of discipline. Examination of the table reveals a significant ($p > .0001$) change in the non-interventionist and interactionalists pretest mean score and their posttest mean score (i.e., $\bar{x} = 17.577$ to $\bar{x} = 14.6520$ and $\bar{x} = 48.0676$ to $\bar{x} = 39.5662$). There was a non significant rise in the interventionists pretest to posttest mean score (i.e., $\bar{x} = 34.3569$ to $\bar{x} = 34.8215$).

Table 9

T-Tests for Student Teachers Pre-Test and Posttest Score on Each Discipline Model (N=302)

| SCORE | PRE-TEST | | | POSTTEST | | | t value | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | d.f. | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | d.f. | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | | |
| INTERVENTIONIST | 301 | 34.3569 | 11.5547 | 301 | 34.8215 | 17.5462 | -.4192 | .675 |
| NON-INTERVENTIONIST | 301 | 17.5770 | 10.1603 | 301 | 14.6520 | 11.7790 | 3.920 | .0001 |
| INTERACTIONALIST | 301 | 48.0676 | 8.2945 | 301 | 39.5662 | 16.6740 | 8.6451 | .0001 |

Question 3

Do student teachers differ from directing teachers in their beliefs about discipline?

At the beginning of student teaching, student teachers' mean ranking

($\bar{x}$ = 1.8179) of the three models of discipline was significantly ($p > .05$) higher than their directing teachers' mean ranking ($\bar{x}$ = 1.6810). However, the student teachers' posttest mean ranking ($\bar{x}$ = 1.5463) was lower but not significantly different from their directing teachers' mean ranking ($\bar{x}$ = 1.6810). (See Table 10) Inspection of the frequencies and percentages of student teachers' and directing teachers' ranking of each model of discipline revealed that the pre-test and posttest order of rankings was the same for both groups--non-interventionist, interventionist and interactionalist.

Table 10

T-Tests for Student Teachers Vs. Directing Teachers Ranking of Discipline Models (N=512)

| TESTING PERIOD | STUDENTS | | | TEACHERS | | | t value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | N | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | |
| PRE-TEST RANKING | 302 | 1.8179 | .6988 | 210 | 1.6810 | .6621 | 2.2280* |
| POSTTEST RANKING | 302 | 1.5463 | .8449 | 210 | 1.6810 | .6621 | 1.7034 |

*$p > .05$

Table 11 gives the student teachers' and directing teachers' pre-test mean score on each model of discipline. Examination of the table reveals a significant difference between the mean score of student teachers and the mean score of directing teachers on the interventionists and interactionalists model (i.e., $\bar{x}$ = 34.3568 vs. $\bar{x}$ = 40.9124 and $\bar{x}$ = 48.0676 vs. $\bar{x}$ = 43.3275). There was no significant difference between the two groups mean score on the non-interventionist model.

Table 11

T-Tests for Student Teachers Vs.
Directing Teachers Pre-Test Score on
Each Discipline Model (N=512)

| DISCIPLINE MODEL | STUDENTS | | | TEACHERS | | | t value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | N | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | |
| INTERVENTIONISTS | 302 | 34.3568 | 11.5546 | 210 | 40.9124 | 13.1873 | -5.559* |
| NON INTERVENTIONISTS | 302 | 17.5770 | 10.1603 | 210 | 15.7486 | 11.7638 | 1.8761 |
| INTERACTIONALISTS | 302 | 48.0676 | 8.2945 | 210 | 43.3275 | 9.5104 | 5.9860* |

*p > .05

The student teachers' and directing teachers' posttest mean score on each model of discipline is arrayed in Table 12. Inspection of Table 12 shows a significant difference between student teachers and directing teachers on all three models---interventionists $\bar{x}$ = 34.8222 vs. $\bar{x}$ 40.9124; non-interventionists $\bar{x}$ = 14.6522 vs. $\bar{x}$ = 15.7486; and interactionalists $\bar{x}$ = 39.5669 vs. 43.3275.

Table 12

T-Tests for Student Teachers Vs. Directing Teachers
Posttest Score on Each Discipline Model (N=512)

| DISCIPLINE MODEL | STUDENTS | | | TEACHERS | | | t value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | N | $\bar{x}$ | S.D. | |
| INTERVENTIONISTS | 302 | 34.8222 | 17.5450 | 210 | 40.9124 | 13.1873 | 17.012* |
| NON INTERVENTIONISTS | 302 | 14.6522 | 11.7790 | 210 | 15.7486 | 11.7638 | 3.2433* |
| INTERACTIONALISTS | 302 | 39.5669 | 16.6723 | 210 | 43.3275 | 9.5104 | 10.5049* |

p > .05

## Summary

Question I. Do student teachers have a well thought out, consistent set of beliefs about discipline?

Overall, the data relevant to Question I indicate that student teachers consistently ranked non-interventionists, interventionists and interactionalists, in descending order, as their most preferred model of discipline. This ranking was unaffected by the student teachers' sex, race, age, or program major. When these rankings of most preferred models of discipline were correlated with scores indicating the student teachers' ability to select specific beliefs and techniques indicative of each model of discipline, correlations for beginning student teachers were consistent for non-interventionists and interactionalists but not for interventionist. At the end of student teaching the correlations were consistent for all three models. However, there was no consistency between how often student teachers believed they utilized each model of discipline and their ability to select beliefs and techniques indicative of each model of discipline.

Question II. Student teachers change their beliefs about discipline as a function of student teaching.

The student teachers' general order of preference for the three discipline models remained the same across the student teaching experience, but that a significantly larger number of student teachers chose the interventionists model at the end than at the beginning of student teaching. After student teaching, student teachers less often selected the beliefs and techniques consistent with the non-interventionist and interactionalist models of discipline. No significant change occurred in their choice of beliefs and techniques consistent with the interventionists model.

Question III. Student teachers adopt their directing teachers beliefs about discipline.

The student teachers' and directing teachers' general order of preference for the three discipline models was the same at the beginning and end of the student teaching experience. At the beginning, however, a larger number of student teachers than directing teachers chose the interactionalists model and a larger number of directing teachers chose the interventionists model. Both, student teachers and directing teachers preferred the non-interventionists model with about equal frequency. After their student teaching experience, however, a large enough number of student teachers had changed their general views about discipline so that there was no longer statistical or absolute difference between the percent of student teachers and directing teachers choosing each discipline model as their most preferred. At the beginning of student teaching, directing teachers more often selected discipline beliefs and techniques consistent with the interventionist model and student teachers more often selected discipline beliefs and techniques consistent with the interactionalists model. Both groups chose the beliefs and techniques representative of the non-interventionists model at an equal rate. After the student teaching experience, student teachers' selection of discipline beliefs and techniques was significantly different than that of teachers. They scored lower on all three discipline models than directing teachers.

## Bibliography


Bloch, Alfred, MD. "The Battered Teacher." Today's Education. March-April, 1977, pp. 58-62.

Cervetti, Michael J. and George W. Etheridge. "I Believe the Best Way to Discipline Is..." Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA., November 13, 1980.

Fine, Marvin J. The Teacher's Role in Classroom Management. Lawrence, Kansas: Psych-Ed. Associates, 1973.

Gallup, George H. "The 13th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools." Kappan, September, 1981, pp. 33-47.

Glickman, Carl D. and Roy T. Tamashiro. "Clarifying Teachers' Beliefs About Discipline." Educational Leadership, March, 1980, pp. 459-464.

Good, Thomas L. and Jere E. Brophy. Looking in Classrooms. (Second Edition). New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1978.

Long, James D. and Virginia H. Frye. Making It Till Friday: A Guide To Successful Classroom Management. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Book Company, Publishers, 1977.

Lortie, Dan C. School Teacher. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Osborn, D. Keith and Janie D. Osborn. Discipline and Classroom Management. Athens, Georgia: Education Associates, 1977.

Raffini, James P. Discipline: Negotiating Conflicts with Today's Kids. Englewood, Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Tamashiro, Roy T. "Beliefs on Discipline Inventory." in Solving Discipline Problems: Strategies for Classroom Teachers by C.H. Wolfgang and C.D. Glickman. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Wolfgang, Charles H. and Carl D. Glickman. Solving Discipline Problems: Strategies for Classroom Teachers. Boston, MA.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Wolfgang, Charles H. Personal Communication, October, 1981.

_____"Whose in the Classroom?" NEA Reporter. Vol. 20, No. 3, April/May, 1981.